

REMARKS

Please reconsider the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank Examiner for carefully considering the present application.

Claims 1-26 are currently pending. By way of this reply, claim 25 has been amended.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(e) in View of Barrett

Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application 2003/0135490 by Barrett et al. (“Barrett”).

Independent claim 1 as filed recites:

A computer-implemented method for ranking a collection of information associated with a plurality of search queries, comprising:
identifying an input signal indicating an interest in a first piece of information in the collection;

determining a search query associated with the first piece of information;

determining a search query associated with a second piece of information from the collection;

determining whether the search query associated with the first piece of information and the search query associated with the second piece of information are the same; and

if the search query associated with the first piece of information and the search query associated with the second piece of information are the same,

determining a score for the second piece of information based at least in part on the input signal, and

ranking at least some of the collection of information based on the score. (emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 recites a method that includes determining whether a search query associated with a first piece of information and a search query associated with a second piece of information are the same. If the search queries are the same, claim 1 further recites determining a score for the second piece of information based at least in part on an input signal indicating an interest in the first piece of information and ranking at least some of a collection of information based on the score. If a user is interested in one piece of information, he tends to be also interested in other information associated with the same search query (or queries), because they tend to share common characteristics that interest the user. Therefore, the input signal may also indicate an interest in other information associated with the same search query (or queries) as the first piece of information. Likewise, independent claims 18 and 25 recite the claimed features cited above.

Barrett, among other differences, does not disclose the claimed features emphasized above. Barrett, in contrast, discloses a method to determine a score for information based on a query using scores for the same information based on different queries. See Barrett, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0046] (“This approach uses the enhanced popularity score of the same information based on a different query.”). Thus, Barrett concerns whether queries are similar and not whether they are the same.

Examiner cited paragraphs [0046], [0047], and [0053] of Barrett for the element of “determining whether the search query associated with the first piece of information and the search query associated with the second piece of information are the same.” However, the cited paragraphs only disclose a method to determine whether different queries associated with the same information are “similar enough” (see paragraph [0046]), and not whether two pieces of information are associated with a same search query. Barrett determines similar but

different queries associated with the same information to use an enhanced popularity score (EPS) of the information of a query for the information of a similar but different query without an EPS. See Barrett, paragraph [0046] (“This approach uses the enhanced popularity score of the same information based on a different query.”). Determining whether two pieces of information are associated with a same search query would not achieve this effect and is different from what is disclosed in Barrett. In fact, in Barrett there is no hint or suggestion of determining whether two pieces of information are associated with a same search query.

In view of the above, Barrett fails to disclose each and every limitation recited in independent claims 1, 18 and 25. Thus, independent claims 1, 18 and 25 are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 102 rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-26, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited reference. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Stephen R. Lawrence, et al.

Date: June 6, 2007

By: /Jie Zhang/

Jie Zhang, Reg. No.: 60,242
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7297
Fax: (650) 938-5200